

### **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application and the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 12, 2004. Applicants also thank the Examiner for indicating that the drawings filed on April 8, 2004 are accepted.

#### **Summary of Examiner Interview**

An Examiner Interview was conducted on September 10, 2007. An Interview Summary was submitted by the Examiner on September 12, 2007. Applicants have reviewed the Interview Summary and agree with its contents.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-39 were pending in this application. Claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, 35, and 38 have been cancelled by this reply without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 31, 34, and 37 are independent. The remaining dependent claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 31, 34, and 37.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 28, 31, 34, 36, 37, and 39 have been amended to clarify various aspects of the invention, correct antecedent basis errors, and/or correct typographical errors. The claims, as amended, correspond to the claim discussed during the Examiner Interview.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> During the interview, the Examiner noted that the proposed amendments included some antecedent basis errors. These errors have been corrected in the amended claims included with this response.

Applicants assert that no new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in the originally filed claims, Figures 1 and 2, and in paragraphs [0009] and [0032] of the Specification.

#### **Amendments to the Specification**

Paragraph [0004] has been amended to correct minor typographical errors. Further, paragraph [0047] has been amended to include the text corresponding to the following acronyms: EPROM and EEPROM. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments.

#### **Specification Objections**

As discussed above, paragraphs [0004] and [0047] have been amended to address the objections raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 4 and 10 are objected to because of informalities regarding the grammar of "the decrypting the database." Claims 4 and 10 are hereby amended in accordance with the Examiner suggestions. Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is requested.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite due to antecedent basis problems and typographical errors. Claims 35 and 38 have been cancelled by this reply.

Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. The remaining claims have been amended to address the issues raised by the Examiner in the rejection. Accordingly, the withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article entitled "Authentication in Distributed Systems: Theory and Practice" (hereafter "Lampson"). Claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, 35, and 38 have been cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, "[f]irst, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." MPEP § 2143. Further, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." MPEP § 2143.03.

As discussed above, the Examiner has indicated that the amended claims overcome the cited prior art. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 31, 34, and 37 are not obvious over the cited prior art. Pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 37202/136001; 040098).

Dated: September 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/  
Robert P. Lord  
Registration No.: 46,479  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicants